

R E M A R K S

Upon the SECOND PART of

6

P R I N C I P L E S

POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS;

Being intended,

As a SUPPLEMENT to the LETTER
ABERDEEN,

In Answer to

NORMAN SIEVWRIGHT, A. M.

Minister of the authorised Congregation in BRECHIN.



Psal. l. 19. 20. *Thou givest thy mouth to evil, and thy tongue
frameth deceit.*

*Thou sittest and speakest against thy brother; thou slanderest thine
own mother's son.*

By Dr Alexander Drommond

E D I N B U R G H.

Printed for, and sold by JOHN WILSON, Bookseller
in the ROYAL EXCHANGE.

M D C C L X V I I I.

R E M A R K S, &c.

R. S.

AS your old acquaintance Mr ----- has in his letter from Aberdeen, with a good deal of humour, exposed the weakness of your political reasonings in the *first part* of your celebrated preservative, I hardly expect that we shall have more trouble from you on that subject. But as my friend and brother, either for want of time or information, has not so fully obviated some of your objections against the bishops of our church, as they may be; and as your partisans would probably triumph, if we continued any longer silent, and say they are unanswerable; therefore this comes abroad as a fuller reply to the *second part* of your performance, wherein you have equally attacked the mission and religious principles both of the bishops and inferior clergy of our Episcopal church.

Some of your arguments strike at the whole order: and gloriously tend to cut off our succession at one blow: While others are aimed at particular persons only, and seem levelled rather against the *regularity* than the *essence* of our mission. I shall speak a little to each, and hope to shew, that what you have said, neither disproves our principles, nor affects our orders.

And *first*, as to your *endeavour* to destroy a whole national church at once; and that I presume your mother-church, wherein you were born and bred; or, if not, at least a sister-church to your own the church of England; this endeavour, I say, must be owned to be a *bold* attempt, if it is not a very *good* one. Indeed, it may give you a chance to be as much talked of as

the famed Erostratus, who, from the glorious motive of doing something that might be spoken of, fired the temple of Diana. And although you will not, I imagine, succeed perfectly to your wish, and make the world believe, that the *great body* of the non-jurant clergy in Scotland are a parcel of fools and knaves, cheats and impostors, without mission and without authority, and of consequence a set of fellows who richly deserve the gallows; yet, for your comfort, reflect, that when you have miscarried, your friends will say of you, what the poet did of Phaeton;---*Magnis tamen excidit ausis* :--- He fell in attempting great things.

But to proceed to your objections against the bishops of the church of Scotland. They are founded upon the supposition, that our fathers now are, or formerly have been guilty, of these three crimes, Nonconformity, Heresy, and Simony.

I. And *first* you say, our bishops have no right to spiritual jurisdiction, because their predecessors were deprived for Nonconformity by the civil powers at the Revolution. The consequence of which, according to you, is, That no lawful authority can be conveyed by those deprived bishops, and especially to persons who persist in the same crime. And as you are conscious that the force of this argument depends upon this question, Whether ecclesiastical persons may be lawfully deprived of their spiritual jurisdiction by the state? therefore, in support of that position, you have introduced the story of Abiathar, who in the days of Solomon was banished for high treason, and thereby thrust out from being priest unto the Lord: Which you say, is the only case applicable to the bishops of the church of Scotland, that either sacred or profane history furnishes. Now, Sir, as one swallow does not make a summer, nor one precedent establish any point of law, I might justly object to your *single* case of Abiathar, though never so exact and fairly represented, as utterly unable for supporting

porting so great a superstructure as you have thought proper to raise upon it. And I have still greater reason to do this, if it be neither a *parallel* case, nor by you *fairly represented*: Both which I proved at great length, and by a variety of arguments, in my two MSS. epistles of the 26th September and 15th October last, which I presume you received. But the necessity of publishing so long a dissertation at this time, is in a great measure superseded by what has appeared on the same subject, in the letter from Aberdeen above-mentioned; and therefore I shall endeavour somewhat to abridge this point.

First then, You will please to observe, in answer to your case of Abiathar, that Solomon had more extensive powers over the priests of the law, than kings can now pretend to over the ministers of the gospel. For he had a divine warrant for ordering the courses of the priests, 1 Chron. xxviii. 11. and downwards, compared with 2 Chron. viii. 14. --- Whereas no monarch now on earth can produce so clear a charter, either for giving *authority* to, or taking *spiritual jurisdiction* away from, Christian bishops, (see the letter from Aberdeen, pages 33. 34.) and therefore one may as well justify the burning of churches at the Reformation, by the command of God to the Israelites to destroy the groves of the Canaanites; or argue that theft is now lawful, because the Jews spoiled the Egyptians; as defend lay-deprivations by the case of Abiathar, even supposing it to have been as you have represented it; which for certain it was not.

For, in the *second* place, it is not true that Zadok was of the family of Eli as well as Abiathar, as you affirm, page 38. otherwise, the thrusting out of Abiathar, and putting Zadok in his room, had in no sense been a completion of the prophecy in Shiloh against the house of Eli, as the Spirit of God affirms it to be, 1 Kings ii. 27. Because, according to your account of
the

the matter, the house of Eli was as much exalted by the promotion of Zadok, as humbled by the depression of Abiathar.

Nor is it fact, *thirdly*, that Abiathar was the eldest branch of the Aaronic family, and as such "in respect of precedence preferable to Zadok, and in point of dignity above him;" as you alledge, page 38. For although you take it for granted, that Ahimelech, the father of Abiathar, was Zadok's elder brother; yet the falsity of that supposition appears from what has been said already, to wit, That Zadok neither was, nor possibly could be one of Eli's descendents; and consequently not Ahimelech's younger brother, who you acknowledge, and for certain was, the son of Ahitub, the son of Phinehas, the son of Eli. Indeed it is so far from being true, that Abiathar was the representative of Eleazar (after Nadab and Abihu) the eldest son of Aaron, that you are the first person I ever heard suppose him to have been of Eleazar's family at all: The other writers that I have seen, having unanimously represented him as of the house of Ithamar; and they imagined, that Eli had, in the days of the judges, got possession of the high-priesthood, on account of some legal or moral disqualification in the eldest branch of the Aaronic family. Mean time, what you have advanced on this head, is no discovery of a truth before unknown, but a flat contradiction to divine inspiration; as will be obvious to any who shall take the trouble to read the following texts, 1 Chron. vi. 3.---8. xxvii. 17. 22. and xxix. 22. For there he will find Zadok in the list of *lineal* and *hereditary* high-priests from Aaron through Eleazar, (but not a word of Abiathar, or his father Ahimelech, or predecessor Eli:) there he will see him stiled *ruler* and *prince of the Aaronites*, and consequently the chief of them: And finally, there he will see him anointed by David's order to be *priest*, that is, *high-priest*, when Solomon was anointed king.

And

And if to this it be added, that Zadok is constantly put *before* Abiathar where-ever they are mentioned together in holy scripture, there can no doubt remain but that he was always the principal personage of the two, and the eldest son of the Aaronic family; and as such, heir to that zealous high-priest to whom God gave the covenant of an everlasting priesthood, Numb. xxv. 13. So that if Abiathar, as successor to Eli, was in possession of the high-priesthood, when Solomon came to the throne, which I very much doubt; it was an act of justice which the king owed to Zadok, to install him in that supreme dignity, and to dispossess Abiathar; because this last could have no right to it, when there was one of the eldest branch of Aaron's family equally capable, and certainly as worthy to govern the church of God as he was. And therefore to suppose Solomon to have done this much, makes nothing in favour of lay-deprivation.

But, *fourthly*, what shews clearly the misapplication of Abiathar's case to the purpose for which you have produced it, is this, that Abiathar's punishment was merely of a civil nature, which affected his sacerdotal office *consequentially only*, by banishing him from the ark and tabernacle; but neither took away his *power* of ministering for the people, nor his *right* to do it, in case he had been permitted to return to Jerusalem where the ark resided, or to go to Gibeon where the tabernacle was. That Abiathar's punishment was merely of a civil nature, appears from the very words of his sentence: *Get thee to Anathoth, unto thine own fields, for thou art worthy of death: but I will not at this time put thee to death, because thou barest the ark of the Lord God before David my father, &c.* Where we see, that the priest was banished to his *own fields*, that is, to the fields which belonged to his *sacerdotal office*. For, being of the tribe of Levi, he had no *natural inheritance*, no fields of his *own* but what he had by his

his *priesthood*. And therefore, if by that sentence his *right* to officiate as a priest had been taken away from him, (as he was accidentally thrust out by it from being a priest unto the Lord) the fields which belonged to his office, had no longer been his, but, *ipso facto*, the property of his successor; nor could the king have given, or he enjoyed them, on that supposition, without sacrilege. Wherefore, since Abiathar was permitted to enjoy *the fields at Anathoth* which belonged to him *as a priest*, and was in no other respect punished but by being confined to *those fields*, it clearly follows, that he still retained his *priestly* character, and was only prevented from the execution of his sacred function, by being banished both from the ark and tabernacle, as I have already said, before one of which a priest could alone officiate. So that here was no lay-deprivation, like what happened to the anti-revolution bishops, but only banishment, a punishment merely secular, which Solomon might justly inflict upon Abiathar, and any rightful sovereign, for the same or a less crime, may now a-days inflict upon any bishop or priest within his dominions.

This account of Abiathar's sentence as a *civil* punishment only, is confirmed, 1 Kings iv. 4. because there we still find him, after his banishment, mentioned as *priest*, in conjunction with Zadok. For, though you have referred to many texts to blind people's eyes, and make them believe that the Abiathar there spoken of was a different person under the same name; yet not one of those texts makes for your purpose, but quite the contrary. Indeed, as all the transactions recorded 1 Kings iv. happened the very same year, (see the scripture chronology) perhaps within a few months or weeks after the banishment of Abiathar, and there is no intimation of his death at Anathoth within that short period, we have just reason to conclude, that he
was

was still alive and in possession of his priesthood, though by his confinement he was incapacitated from officiating.

For ought then that you have yet said, neither the orders or authority of the Scottish bishops are in any danger, as the case of Abiathar can never be a precedent for lay-deprivations, but quite the contrary. Mean time, however that may be, you are the first clergyman, I believe, of the church of England, that ever called either the orders or authority of our bishops into question: At least, you are the first that ever I heard of. And to shew you that I have reason for what I say, and cause to wonder at the *boldness*, as well as the *novelty* of your assertions, I shall here transcribe part of a letter from a clergyman of your own communion, dated, *Virginia, 13th July 1767*, which runs thus: "Your favour of the 12th April last, was delivered to me by my niece Jeany. Your testimony of her moral and religious character, and that she has been confirmed, gives me much pleasure. When I was ordained by Dr Gibson bishop of London, amongst other things, I had occasion to tell his Lordship, that I was confirmed by the bishop of Edinburgh, Dr Lumsden; to which his Lordship replied, That it was *as well done as if it had been done by any bishop in England*. His predecessor, Dr Robinson, said the same thing, with respect to *ordination*, to a friend of mine, Mr David Stuart. Mr Stuart was ordained by *Dr Millar bishop of Edinburgh*." Subscribed, William Willie.

In this letter, you have not only the opinion of your brother Mr Willie, but of two successive *bishops of London*, both men of considerable note, with respect to our bishops mission: And you see them bearing full and ample testimony, both as to their power of *confirmation and ordination*, though discountenanced *then* as much as now, by the *civil powers*, and though their predecessors were deprived at the Revolution for non-conformity.

conformity. Nay, I know, that after the famous act of parliament, *anno* 1748, which you seem to exult in, as an almost miraculous interposition of divine providence against the wicked nonjurors, none of the renegadoes from our communion could obtain ordination in England, till they infamously denied that they were *before in orders in Scotland*: So sensible were the English bishops, at that time, of the lawfulness of our authority, and of the unlawfulness of re-ordaining those whom our bishops had admitted into holy orders. I may add farther, that if I am not greatly misinformed, there is not one bishop in England, who has yet ventured to institute any clergyman of your communion, to a charge in Scotland. Which, if true, is surely for no other reason, but because they are still conscious that there are lawful bishops in Scotland; and consequently know, that, while that is the case, they have no right to interfere. If this is not fact, pray publish *your own letters* of collation to your Brechin congregation in your ecclesiastical history, that we may know upon what footing you stand; and that your people may be satisfied that you are not an independent, subject to no head, and accountable to no governor, as you are supposed to be; but that you are settled by some one bishop or other, and answerable to his jurisdiction. In England, you know, that after a clergyman is ordained, and the patron has presented him to the living, he must still have institution from the bishop, before he can lawfully officiate; because it is the episcopal authority which makes him pastor of the flock, or in sacred stile, makes him overseer, Acts xx. 28. Nor is this form of procedure peculiar to the church of England; it does and must prevail over the whole world, where-ever an episcopal church is regularly constituted, either *without*, or under the protection of the state. And therefore you must be sensible, that the election of the people of Brechin can
give

give you no pastoral relation to them, without the authority of the bishop of the diocese, if he is a lawful bishop, that is, neither heretic nor schismatic; or without institution from some neighbouring bishop, if the diocesan is heretical. This I say you must be sensible of, not only because it is the received principle of all episcopal churches, but because I perceive you have read, and seem to approve of Archbishop Wake's translation of St. Ignatius's epistles, wherein, I am certain, you behoved to find it.

But, leaving this to *your serious consideration* afterwards, I go on to consider the remaining part of your first objection against the bishops of the church of Scotland,---which is, " That they have failed in their
 " duty to the civil magistrate, and therefore have, *ipso*
 " *facto*, forfeited their title to the character of catho-
 " lic bishops, and with their characters all spiritual ju-
 " risdiction, p. 159." And you will not agree that the parallel be drawn between them and the bishops of the primitive church, because you say, " That was not
 " the case with these last : " That is, the primitive bishops did not fail in their duty to the civil magistrate, although they were persecuted, as you observe, by those very magistrates, " for worshipping the true
 " God, and Mediator between God and man, in oppo-
 " sition to the fictitious gods of deluded idolaters." This is the substance of your reasoning, p. 158. 159. 160. 161. Now, Sir, if it be true, that the primitive bishops did not " oppose the civil laws of the Roman
 " empire, establishing the civil authority of the Roman
 " emperors," as you acknowledge; and if their continuing in obedience to those Roman, and I may add, *Heathen* emperors, was the very cause why " they did
 " not forfeit their title to the character of catholic bi-
 " shops, and with their character all spiritual jurisdic-
 " tion;" as you have again and again told us, in the page just quoted, and before, p. 146. I beg leave to
 B 2 know,

know, whether, since " King James VII. was appointed
 " to be ruler, king, chief magistrate, or supreme head
 " of the legislature, according to the ordinance of
 " man, the voice of the legislature, according to the
 " constitution;" as you confess, p. 122. I say, since
 King James VII. was true and rightful king of England
 before the Revolution, by your own acknowledgment,
 I beg leave to know, whether, upon the principles
 laid down by you, both the *English and Scottish* bishops
 ought not to have continued faithful to him, even al-
 though he had persecuted them for worshipping the
 true God, and the Mediator between God and man,
 (which yet I never heard him accused of doing, bigot-
 ted Papist as he was)? For you say, the primitive bi-
 shops were persecuted on that account by the Roman
 emperors, and that, notwithstanding thereof, they fail-
 ed not in their duty to them. And you not only
 commend those bishops for persevering in their duty
 to the civil magistrate, but you tell us, that it was *that*
very perseverance which preserved their title to the cha-
 racter of *catholic bishops*, and with their character their
right to spiritual jurisdiction, as already observed.

Ay but, say you, King James VII. " did not fulfil
 " the character of a legal ruler. Instead of being a
 " terror to evil works, he was a terror to good works;
 " he was a terror to all who were desirous to avoid
 " the idolatry and superstition of the court of Rome,
 " p. 122." Be it so: but was he a greater terror to
 good works than the heathen emperors were, *who per-
 secuted the primitive bishops, for worshipping the true
 God, and only Mediator between God and man?* Or, is
 the idolatry and superstition of the court of Rome more
 dangerous to the souls of men, than the idolatry and
 superstition of *Heathenism*? If not, then it follows
 from your principles, that such of the bishops at the
 Revolution as continued faithful to King James, retain-
 ed their characters as catholic bishops, and with their cha-
 cha-

characters their spiritual jurisdiction. And by the rule of contraries it follows, that such of them as *did not* persevere in duty to him, *forfeited their title to the character of catholic bishops, and with their character all right to spiritual jurisdiction.* And if this be so, as you have taught us to believe, there is some reason why you should suspect *your own mission*, but the non-juring clergy have nothing to fear on that score. This is what logicians call, *argumentum ad hominem*, or a just conclusion drawn from your own premisses; and the only remark that I shall make upon it is, that you have wounded yourself incurably, while you vainly fancied you had given a mortal thrust to your antagonists. So dangerous a weapon is reason in the hands of one who does not know how to use it.---And so much for your first argument.

II. The *second* objection against the bishops of the church of Scotland is heresy.---Or to give it in your own elegant and perspicuous language,---The Scottish bishops "are condemned by their own pleas, through "their attested heterodoxy and irregularities in other "respects besides politics."---This is your introduction to that dreadful accusation anent the usages, which you are pleased to characterize as a revival of the Romish mass. And having dressed them up in this hideous form, and made them the very essence of idolatry and superstition, one need not wonder that you represent the persons who adhere to these ancient truths, as guilty of such horrible practices, that no pious and well disposed Christian "can allow himself to put up "with them, or to continue in the fellowship of those "who have committed such crimes, and persist in the "same, &c." Now, Sir, in answering this objection, I will not follow you through that maze of ignorance in which you have wandered for about 100 pages, because every thing you have said against the usages, had been again and again said, and as often answered, long before

before you knew what that word meant; and I may add, that you are sufficiently confused in the letter, so often mentioned, from Aberdeen. Besides, the falseness of your conclusion on this topic is so obvious, that it must be observed by persons of the meanest capacity. For, thanks be to God, there are few or none of our communion so ill informed now-a-days, as to think it lawful to separate from the church, or shake off the authority of their bishops, upon account of the usages. And indeed, it would be strange if there were any so grossly ignorant. Seeing, upon the supposition that the usages are errors, for certain they are not dangerous errors; and of consequence not heresies, as you affirm; otherwise the *whole Christian world* must have been involved in *heresy* from the *earliest* ages down to the Reformation: It having been unanswerably proved, by the learned and pious Dr Hickes, Dr Brett, Dr Wagstaff and others, that the usages were certainly received in the pure and primitive church of Christ, and, for ought that appears, continued till the days of Bucer and Calvin; by whose influence they were first thrown out of the liturgy.

What therefore I propose to do on this head, is only briefly to shew, that the church of England, of which you profess to be a priest, reformed upon this very plan: That her *first* liturgy contained every one of the *usages* which you stigmatize as heresies; that this liturgy was drawn up by martyrs and confessors for the *protestant* religion against Popery; was approved of by both the convocations of Canterbury and York, that is, by all the clergy of the reformed church of England; and, finally, had the approbation of a protestant king and parliament, as *being concluded and set forth by the aid of the Holy Ghost*: Which last words are so remarkable, that I am persuaded, the like were never used of any other liturgy, by any other parliament.

Now, Sir, that the church of England did reform herself

herself according to the plan which you have so boldly and so indecently condemned, I will bring incontestible evidence, even no less than, to use your own words, "the voice of the legislature;" that is, an act of a protestant parliament, even that very act passed, *anno* 1549, which established the first liturgy of King Edward VI. For, speaking of the committee of bishops and clergy which were appointed to draw it up, it says, That they had "as well an eye and respect to the most sincere and pure Christian religion taught by the scripture, as to the usages in the primitive church, &c." And what those usages in the primitive church were, to which the compilers of the liturgy had an eye, and to which they were *commanded* indeed to have an eye, we learn from the liturgy itself, to be the very same which you have *modestly* and *sensibly* *stigmatized* as *heresies*, and as the very sink and corruption of the church of Rome! namely, *the mixture, prayers for the dead, the invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the elements in consecration, and finally, the oblation of the elements as a sacrifice to God.* For all these, and none other but these, are to be found in the said liturgy. The order for the mixture you will find in the rubrick before the communion-office, where the minister is commanded "to put to the wine a little pure and clean water." And in the prayer for the whole state of Christ's church, (to the rubrick of which, by the bye, the words *militant here on earth*, are not added) there is not only a very full *commemoration* of the faithful departed, but an express prayer for them in these words, ---"We commend unto thy mercy, O Lord, all other thy servants which are departed hence from us with the sign of faith, and do now rest in the sleep of peace. Grant unto them, we beseech thee, thy mercy and everlasting peace, &c." And, in like manner, you will observe an express prayer of *invocation and oblation*, precisely in the terms of King Charles

Charles I. his Scots communion-office. I farther add on this head, that this liturgy, containing those usages, was compiled (among other great and learned reformers who suffered for the cause of truth, against the errors of Popery) chiefly by Archbishop Cranmer and Bishop Ridley, who bore their testimony even unto blood; as Mr Wheatly, a clergyman of *your own communion since the Revolution*, has fully shewn, in his appendix to the introductory discourse to his excellent illustration of the Book of Common Prayer, 6th edition, p. 25. 26. where you will also see every thing that I have said of Edward VI. his first liturgy, and the usages, fully confirmed. And now, Sir, things standing thus, I desire you to blush, if you can, at your own ignorance, in accusing the Scottish bishops of heresy, and as revivers of the mass, for no other reason, but because they have restored, or rather wish to restore those ancient usages, which the first reformers of the church of England not only practised, but the first reformed parliament declared to be agreeable to the *word of God, and the primitive church*.

But I think I hear you say, that the usages were afterwards left out of the liturgy, and a new office established by act of parliament, which proves that they were at least errors, if not heresies. To which I answer, That though the usages were left out of the second liturgy, and a new office established, the very act of parliament which ordained the alteration, does ample honour to the *first* liturgy, and clearly shews, that the changes made in it, were not from a conviction that the usages were so much as *errors*, far less *heresies*; but for the satisfaction of Calvin, Bucer, and other too scrupulous, if not factious and self-designing men. For in the preamble, speaking of the fore-mentioned liturgy, it says,---“ That a very godly order had been
“ set forth, by authority of parliament, for common
“ prayer

“ prayer and administration of sacraments, to be used
 “ in the mother-tongue within the church of England,
 “ agreeable to the word of God and the primitive
 “ church, very comfortable to all good people desiring
 “ to live in Christian conversation, and most profitable
 “ to the estate of this realm. And yet this notwithstanding, a great number of people, in divers parts
 “ of this realm, following their own sensuality, and
 “ living either without knowledge or due fear of God,
 “ do wilfully and damnably abstain, and refuse to come
 “ to their parish church, &c.” And afterwards it adds,
 “ Because there hath arisen, in the use and exercise
 “ of the foresaid common service in the church here-
 “ tofore set forth, divers doubts for the fashion and
 “ manner of the ministration, rather by the curiosity
 “ of the ministers and mistakers, than of any other
 “ worthy cause; therefore, for the more plain and
 “ manifest explanation, &c. The King, with the con-
 “ sent, &c.” Which words are so plain, that they
 need no commentary. For King, Lords and Commons
 are here so far from finding fault with the first liturgy
 on account of the usages, that they stile it *a godly or-
 der, agreeable to the word of God, and the primitive
 church*: They declare the sin of those who absented
 from their parish-churches, while it was in force, to be
a wilful and a damnable sin; and that the exceptions
 made against it proceeded *rather from the curiosity and
 mistakes of the ministers*, than any worthy cause.

If after this it be enquired, how these alterations
 were brought about? The private history of the mat-
 ter is, That Calvin by his letters, and Bucer and Peter
 Martyr, and other foreign Presbyterians then in Eng-
 land, by their influence, having made a party against
 the usages, prevailed with the church of England to
 throw them out, that she might come nearer to the
 other reformed churches. And there is no doubt but
 there were hopes given at that time, that, upon these

changes being made, the whole Calvinistic churches abroad would unite with the church of England: However, though the intention of the church was good, the consequences of the alterations have been miserable. For they have served no other purpose, but to debase the beauty of the best reformed church in the world, by making it deviate from the primitive church of Christ; as not only the acts above-mentioned shew, but some of her worthiest and most learned members, both before and since the Revolution, not obscurely hint. See that great glory of the reformation and ornament of the church of England, the judicious Mr Thorndike, his *Just Weight and Measures*, ch. xxii. p. 159, where speaking on this subject, he has these words;--- “ And seeing the abating of the
 “ first form under Edward VI. hath wrought no effect;
 “ but to give them that desired it an appetite to root
 “ up the whole; what thanks can we render to God;
 “ for escaping so great a danger, but by sticking firm
 “ to a rule that will stick firm to us, and carry us
 “ through any dispute in religion, and land us in the
 “ haven of a quiet conscience, what troubles soever
 “ we pass through, in maintaining that the reformation
 “ of the church will never be according to the rule
 “ which it ought to follow, till it cleave to the catho-
 “ lic church of Christ.” Consult also the appendix
 above-mentioned, of your late friend and brother Mr Wheatly; as also his excellent *Illustration of your present Communion-office*, and in both places you will find an honest confession that the usages are primitive; a sincere regret that ever they were thrown out; and an acknowledgment that it was done at the instigation of Calvin, Bucer, Peter Martyr, and other foreign Presbyterians, as above-narrated. Now, Sir, this being a fact acknowledged by your own friends; as the Presbyterians at home seem not to be greatly in your favour, I may justly wonder, that you should be so
 much

much enamoured with the Presbyterians abroad, as eagerly to adopt a plan of reformation brought about by them, at the expence of departing from the catholic church of Christ: Yet, Sir, this you have done, if we may believe an authority which you dare not appeal from; I mean, not only the whole bench of bishops; but King, Lords and Commons in parliament assembled; for they expressly declared in the act above-mentioned; (as the whole reformed clergy in England, represented in the provinces of Canterbury and York, had before done) that King Edward VI.'s first liturgy was both agreeable to the word of God and the primitive church: Whereas you, with a *non obstante* to so great authority, boldly, but falsely, affirm, that the usages (contained in that liturgy, as we have seen) are not only errors but heresies: The consequence of which is undeniable; that if either the whole clergy of England, or King, Lords and Commons, are judges, you stand condemned both by the *word of God* and the primitive church. I have only to add farther on this point, that although the usages were left out of King Edward VI.'s second liturgy, through presbyterian influence, as your own friends acknowledge, and that to the great regret of all them who have any reverence for the ancient catholic church; yet they were never given up, but on the contrary, even those that now-a-days are most exceptionable, I mean, the sacrifice of the holy eucharist, and prayers for the faithful departed, were constantly maintained by many of the most learned and worthy sons of the church of England since that time; as, Bishop Poyntet, Bishop Andrews, Mr Thorndike, Archbishop Laud, his chaplain the great Mr Mede, before the Revolution; and Bishop Bull, the Rev. Mr John Johnson, and Mr Wheatly, &c. &c. since that period; not to mention Mr Nelson, author of the feasts and fasts of the church of England, Dr Hickes, Dr Grabe, and many others of the nonjuring profession. And so

much for your second objection against the bishops of this national church.

III. The *last* charge you bring against them, is simony. In answer to which I must first in general observe, that simony is a dangerous weapon which cuts with both edges, and like Drawcanfir's sword, hews down friends and foes. For such has been the trafficking for bishoprics both in the eastern and western church, in different ages, that if simony nullifies ordination, it would be impossible to be certain that there is one lawful bishop or priest just now in the Christian world. This is well known, and will not be denied by those who are acquainted with the history of the church: And the practice being so general, it cannot reasonably be expected that the church of England should be quite free. Indeed, Sir, it is but justice to say, that she has had a large enough share in that kind of commerce. Nay, it is now become so common, that presentations to livings for one vice only are publicly advertised almost in every news-paper, and as publicly bought, sometimes by clergymen for themselves, and sometimes by parents for their children. Nay, Sir, that a late venerable divine got the archbishopric of ----- some thirty years ago, by wagering L. 10000 with Mrs Btwn, a near relation of a late great personage, is as firmly believed in London, as any part of your preachments by the authorised congregation in Brechin. And if it was fact, which I do not affirm, it is not improbable, but the bishop by whom you was ordained, received consecration from the hands of that very unsanctified high-priest. And if so, what, upon your principles, becomes of your own mission? I fear, it will be to seek, and that your authorised flock must even yet discard you as no clergyman. But suppose you could prove that your orders do not run through that corrupt channel; yet, unless you can likewise prove this negative, that none of the bishops from the apostles
down-

downwards, through whom your mission comes, have been guilty of simony, (which my logic tells me, cannot possibly be proved) you never can be sure, according to your doctrine, but that every ministerial act of yours is sacrilege and usurpation: For if any one of them has transgressed in the accursed thing, and whether they have or not you cannot tell, the chain of succession is broken, and down drops your reverence among the number of the laity. This, Sir, is the undeniable consequence of your doctrine about simony. And therefore I hope, that for your own peace of mind, you either do not believe yourself, or else, that you wisely resolve never to think about the matter. For surely, if you are sincere, and at the same time reflect like other reasonable beings, you can never mount the pulpit or compass the altar, without trembling knees and a faltering tongue, lest you be preaching without being sent, or offering the holy mysteries with uncommissioned hands.—Nay, were your doctrine true, this would be the situation of every clergyman now alive; and must have been the situation, one time or other, of every clergyman that has lived for at least 1500 years past, if not since the age of the apostles.—Nor will the condition of the laity be a whit more comfortable; since none of them can be certain, that they have either received valid baptism, or been partakers of a lawful eucharist; because none of them can be sure, but that either their pastor, or the bishop who ordained him, has been guilty of simony, which nullifies their ordination. To this dreadful pass would you reduce, not one or two persons only, but the whole Christian world, priests and people at once. But whatever such as you may imagine, blessed be God, he has not established his priesthood upon so slippery a foundation, as the sanctity of the ordained or the ordainer would sometimes be; but accompanies with his blessing his own institution, whatever be the disposition

sition either of him who receives, or of him who conveys the orders. Eli's sons, though sons of Belial, who knew not the Lord, were as real priests, and their ministrations as efficacious for the faithful people of Israel, as those of their most religious father. Nor is there the least doubt, but that the covetous traitor Judas was as truly an apostle, as St. James the just, or the holiest among the twelve. And as simony, like other crimes, affects the moral character only, I will therefore now say, and will prove it too by the canons of the ancient catholic church, that were what you alledge true of our deceased fathers, it would not invalidate either their orders or the mission of our present bishops. And farther, that though it would, if true, yet that it is an absolute falsehood, and without any just foundation.

1st, I say, that had Bishops Rattray and Dunbar been simoniacally promoted, as you falsely and maliciously affirm, it would not follow that they were no bishops; but only, that their consecrations were irregular. For no principle has been more generally received in the church of God, than that episcopal ordination, where a lawful form of words has been used, conveys an indelible character, even when criminal in the circumstances. This is so true, that even when general councils have in express terms declared ordinations *null*, they do not mean, that the persons they condemn are no clergymen, but only, that they shall not be treated as clergymen, till they are reconciled to the peace of the church. This appears from the 6th canon of the same great council of Chalcedon, quoted by you against simony; which decreed, that if any priest or deacon is ordained at large, (that is, without a title, or the immediate prospect of being settled in a charge) such ordination shall be *null*, and the person no where capable of officiating, to the reproach of the ordainer: And from the 16th canon of the first council of Nice, (the best council, except that of the apostles, which ever
fat)

fat) which determined the ordination of any person who *belongs to*, that is, who *lives in* the diocese of another bishop, to be *null*, if done without the consent of the proper bishop. For, though these great councils decreed such ordinations to be *null*, yet it would be ridiculous to imagine that they thought such trivial offences could make the clergymen's ordinations *void*. I call them trivial offences, in respect of the persons ordained, because for certain the ordainer must in both cases, be considered as the most guilty. And I dare venture to say, that in fact, such ordinations were in no age of the church ever considered as ineffectual, though they often subjected the parties concerned to some temporary inconveniences, and that very justly. But what makes the point that I am contending for clear beyond all doubt is, that the same great council of Nice, canon 8. received the Novatian clergy without reordination, although it is well known, that Novatian's promotion to the episcopate was as irregular and scandalous as any that ever happened in the Christian church :---For he was not only spurred on by Novatus, a factious presbyter, to aim at the supreme dignity, but he filled three obscure, simple, and ignorant Italian bishops drunk, and was by them consecrated during the silence of the night, not only without the consent, but even the knowledge either of the metropolitan or comprovincial bishops: As we learn from Cornelius bishop of Rome his letter to Fabius bishop of Antioch, preserved in Eusebius's history, b. vi. ch. 43. However, as the persons who ordained him were real bishops, though unworthy of their character, and the customary form of the liturgy was observed, the great council of Nice, I say, received the clergy ordained by him, notwithstanding that his own consecration was the most uncanonical and indecent, as far as I know, that the history of the Christian church makes mention of. Whence I conclude, that even simony, though an

an atrocious crime in the sight of God, and scandalous in the eye of man, does not invalidate ordination, but is only a very irregular and sinful circumstance, which by repentance and reconciliation may be done away.

But were it certain that the crime of simony did strictly and literally nullify ordination; and that the canon of Chalcedon, which you quote, were to be understood according to the naked letter; as I think I have clearly shewn from other canons of the same and earlier councils, it is not; yet that would no way affect the consecrations of our present right reverend bishops, because I say,

2dly, That the infamous charge you have brought against Bishops Rattray and Dunbar is an abominable falsehood, without any just foundation. I have reason to suspect this, in the first place, because you blunder in the account you give both of those gentlemen and Mr Keith's consecrations. For you would have us to understand that Messrs Rattray and Dunbar were promoted to the episcopate together, and Mr Keith by himself some time after, while Bishop Millar was under suspension by the college-bishops for concurring in the former consecrations. Whereas the fact was, that Dr Rattray was consecrated by himself, June 4. 1727, and Messrs Dunbar and Keith the 18th thereafter. This shews that your informers know little about the matter, and that they have added such circumstances as they pleased. I am well aware, that it is impossible, strictly speaking, to prove a negative; and therefore I will never attempt to bring demonstration in favours of those gentlemen; but I can adduce more improbable circumstances against the supposition of their being guilty of simony, than you can bring for yourself, supposing you to be accused of lying with your neighbour's wife. Nay, I believe in my conscience, that you are as certainly an adulterer as they were simoniacs; and you may try to bring yourself off in the best manner

ner you can. But to come closer to the point. As you do not alledge that there were two acts of simony, nor charge Bishop Keith with any share of that guilt; and as it is certain that he and Mr Dunbar were both consecrated the same day, and by the same persons, as already observed, this, in all equity, should acquit Mr Dunbar of all guilt likewise, unless you can bring more than hearsay evidence against him; nay, unless you can bring positive and direct proof, which I dare say you cannot. Mean time, till that shall happen, I must take it for granted, that Dr Rattray is the only person against whom the suspicion of bribing his consecrators, at present lies. And how improbable it was, that he should have been guilty of, at once, so heinous and so infamous a crime, will appear from the following considerations.

1st, That he was a gentleman of distinguished rank in his country, chief of an ancient and honourable family, chief indeed of his name, and highly esteemed, by all that had the happiness to know him, for the sweetness of his temper, the affability of his manners, the soundness and extent of his learning, and above all, for the sanctity of his life.

2^{dly}, That the nonjurant bishops in England, on the usage-side, had been consulted about his promotion, and had expressly agreed to consecrate him, upon his going into that country, in case the Scottish bishops refused to do it. And,

3^{dly}, That a bishop in Scotland is not now-a-days as in England, dignified by a splendid title, and enriched by thousands of gold and silver, but, in the eye of the world, has only an empty name, unaccompanied with real power, without revenues and without honours: In short, that to be a bishop in Scotland is to expose one's self to the front of the battle, and if not to become an object of reproach, at least of aversion to the far greatest part of our countrymen. For most people

are, and of a long time have been, almost afraid to be seen in the company of (at least they avoid having any intimacy with) nonjurors, lest they be suspected of disaffection; and therefore, from prudential motives, they generally keep aloof from all of that stamp, and especially from the highest order. And is this a situation eagerly to be courted? Or a place that one would purchase at the expence of his ease, his honour, and his conscience? *Credat Judeus appella!* Indeed, Sir, when these things are considered, he who can believe, that a man of Dr Rattray's character, esteemed for every thing that is good, and sacred, and valuable, I may say, a man of Dr Rattray's sense would have infamously and wickedly purchased the unvendible grace, in the language of antiquity, when, for the trouble of a short journey to Durham, or perhaps to Berwick only, he could have honourably obtained it without money and without price, must be deeply immersed in malice, and void of every grain of that charity which thinketh no evil. Few men, I believe none, are so wicked, or even so foolish as to chuse naked and barren evil for its own sake; and therefore, if ever men of reputation embark in a bad, and at the same time an infamous cause, they must be supposed to be under the strongest temptation, and an almost utter impossibility of compassing their ends by fair and honest means. But this, as I have said, was not Dr Rattray's, nor even Mr Dunbar, or Bishop Keith's case, because they knew how to be promoted, if they had been ambitious of promotion, at a less expence than any bribe could amount to, that could be offered to two bishops as the wages of iniquity; I mean, by going to the borders of England, where they had friends ready to do for them, what they had before done for another Scotsman, to wit, Bishop Gadderer. I may add, that even the synodical censure pronounced by the college-bishops against those gentlemen, if such a censure there was,

I say, even that censure, as you have worded it, sufficiently shews the falsity of the aspersion; for had it been true, or but barely probable, the college would certainly have proceeded upon it, and mentioned it as the foundation of their sentence; seeing they were but too well disposed at that time to have propaled any thing that would have so effectually blackened their antagonists as an accusation of simony would have done. The silence therefore of your synod, if such a one there was, is worth a thousand witnesses; and the story must have been hatched as an after-game. But be that as it will, I will be bold to say, that whatever Mr Dundas or any other of his kidney may have advanced on that head, it will satisfy no one who knew Dr Rattray, that he was guilty. but only shew to what lengths men blinded by prejudice, or biassed by party, will go against those who differ from them. Indeed, Sir, an hundred Dundasses and as many Sievwrights would not blacken one Bishop Rattray in the judgment of any sensible and impartial man of his acquaintance; for if weighed against him, in the balance either of learning or religion, they would be found wanting.

You cannot but know, that a huge superstructure is oftentimes raised upon a very slight foundation, and it was remarkably so in that case. Bishop Rose in Coupar was desired to go to Argyleshire, where Bishop Fullarton resided, to concur with him and Bishop Gadderer in Dr Rattray's consecration; but he having broken or hurt his leg, so that he could not ride on horseback, and having but a small income, and therefore unwilling to hire a chaise, pleaded in excuse the expence of the journey. To remove this objection, Mr Dempster in Dundee offered to bear his charges; and this offer, perfectly innocent, though it had been made either by the consecrators or the bishop elect, as it was not, was afterwards magnified into simony by those who looked at it with jaundiced eyes; and in that

that colour transferred, without the least shadow of pretence, to Bishops Cant and Millar, who had no journey to perform, and therefore were not under the like temptation. This was the whole of that transaction, which gave occasion to the infamous charge that you have so ungenerously and maliciously propagated to the prejudice of those who cannot answer for themselves. It is the misfortune of the wisest and best of men, that they, no more than the less deserving, are able to screen themselves from the venom of the slanderer's tongue: However, it is lucky when malice does break out in the manner yours has done, that it falls, as in this case, upon a gentleman who is above suspicion; because the slander gains but little ground, and so will do but little harm.

As to the instances you give of Bishops Millar and Cant's dotage, in order to facilitate the belief of their being taken advantage of, they are as weak as they are malicious: And therefore it is sufficient to say, that if such little slips and inadvertencies, as that of changing a singular number into a plural, is to be construed a sign of failure in judgment, there is no man, who, in the vigour of his understanding, may not be brought into the catagory of failed persons; because there is none so accurate, but that he will sometimes blunder in such small matters. Nay, I will add, that if any sensible person was to sit on your jury, and judge of the state of your intellect, not by little slips and inadvertencies only, but by the false arguments and wrong conclusions in your Principles Political and Religious, he would certainly vote you a guardian. So dangerous is it for some people to assign the marks of dotage. I have only to add on this head, That to see a clergyman throw dirt and scandal upon the deceased fathers of any Christian church, is, to say the least, a very ugly and indecent sight; but for a member of a society which has suffered so much from the falsehood and
malice

malice of her enemies, in the affair of the nags-head consecration, to do so, is equally against the laws of modesty and prudence. And surely one ought to take the mote out of one's own eye, before he pretend to spy the beam in his neighbour's. But the nonjurors must be calumniated, it seems, at any rate; and you seem resolved to pull down, what you think the temple of Dagon, though, like Samson, you should perish in its ruins. However, whatever your *will* may be, thanks to God, your *power* is not great; and happily too, your pen is as little dangerous as your arm: For, if our principles are never attacked by a more terrible adversary than you have shewn yourself to be, I shall venture to foretel, without the gift of prophecy, that they will *stand fast for ever*, like the faithful witnesses in heaven. Indeed, I have no doubt but they will do so, whoever become their opponents. For truth is eternal; and though almighty God, to answer the wise ends of his providence, may suffer it for a time to be distressed and oppressed, yet, sooner or later, here or hereafter, he will stand forth in the vindication thereof, and for certain will pronounce its encomium before the august assembly of men and angels.---*Magna est veritas et prevalebit.* But to return from this digression. That Messrs Rattray and Dunbar were promoted to the episcopate against the inclination of the majority of the college-bishops, I believe is true; but their consecrations were not on that account irregular, because the college-bishops had no right to challenge such deeds, though without their consent. I have no pleasure in raking into the ashes of the dead, or in exposing the faults of those fathers who have gone before us. On the contrary, if you will give me leave for once to pray for the dead, I am inclined to say, whatever their failings have been, May they rest in peace. However, justice to the injured obliges me to say in general, that it was a very unprecedented step, for bishops, mere-

merely because consecrated in Scotland and by Scotch men, to claim jurisdiction over the church in this country, without being either appointed to particular dioceses by Dr Rose bishop of Edinburgh, the last survivor of the Anti-revolution and local bishops, or chosen by the clergy and people agreeable to ancient form: For one or other of these two, I apprehend, was indispensably necessary to give them a portion of the flock of Christ, and consequently a right to act either in a national or diocesan church. For bishops at large, such as they were, are just like priests or deacons at large, who have no congregations; they can only be said to belong to the *catholic church*, but have no *particular* relation to, and consequently no *right of government* over any one part of it more than another. Their claim to jurisdiction therefore was surely uncanonical; and I may add, that it was still, if possible, more extraordinary, to reduce a whole national church into the form of a single diocese, and by erecting themselves into a college, to change the monarchical government of the church into an aristocracy; because *that*, I am persuaded, had no parallel from the days of the apostles until that time. And if not, Bishop Gadderer had an undoubted right to endeavour, by all lawful means, to restore the primitive form of government, I mean, diocesan episcopacy, as well as the primitive form of worship. And I know not, that by any canon, he who had been duly elected bishop of Aberdeen by the clergy and people, was obliged to submit to the authority of the college-bishops, because it appears from what has been said, that as a college they had no authority. And if they had no authority, the consequence is clear, that they had no right to censure Dr Rattray's, or any other consecration, though without their consent. Whence it again follows, that if they did censure them, the sentence being pronounced *clavæ errante*, was, *ipso facto*, null, and might affect the censurers,

furers, but could do the censured party no harm. For God does not ratify in heaven what is done on earth without his authority; and these bishops could not possibly have his authority, who pretended both to *govern* and *judge*, without being invested with the episcopal *power*, agreeable to the laws of the catholic church, as well as with the episcopal character, which, as already observed, the college-bishops were not. However, as they were real bishops in Scotland, though not of the *church of Scotland*, more than of the church of France or Spain; and moreover, as they held charges or congregations, and by their influence among the people, might have kept up factions and divisions in the church, it was therefore extremely proper that the provincial or diocesan bishops should endeavour a reconciliation with them. And accordingly, like good men and lovers of peace, they proposed some terms of agreement, which, in a synodical meeting held, December 1731, for that purpose, were subscribed to by both parties, as you acknowledge. Now, Sir, although this meeting did not unite the bishops precisely in the same principles, yet it prevented any open rupture, and so far cemented them that they were of *one communion*, as in fact they communicated together, which was all that was essentially necessary. And particularly, the college-bishops, by permitting Bishop Keith and others of his side to sit and vote with them as bishops in that synod, did thereby acknowledge their episcopal authority, and, to all intents and purposes, ratified their consecrations, supposing them to have been before irregular, which I have shewn they were not. This appears, as from other authentic vouchers that might be produced, so from the following agreement, the original of which is yet extant, and can be produced if necessary.----Edinburgh, December 31. 1731. "It is hereby agreed upon betwixt the right reverend Bishop Ochterlonie, " and the right reverend Bishop Rattray, with the
" consent

“ consent and authority of the other bishops of the
 “ national church of Scotland hereto subscribing, that
 “ the diocese of Brechin, together with the Carse of
 “ Gowrie, and the presbyteries of Dundee, Arbroath,
 “ and Mearns, shall be under the inspection of bishop
 “ Ochterlonie; and that the diocese of Dunkeld, to-
 “ gether with the whole presbyteries of Meigle and
 “ Forfar, and church of Methven and parish thereof,
 “ shall be under the inspection of Bishop Rattray.----
 “ Sgned, Andrew Lumfden bishop, David Freebairn
 “ bishop, John Ochterlonie bishop, Thomas Rattray
 “ bishop, John Gillan bishop, Robert Keith bishop.”

I have now done with the first set of your objections,
 which are levelled against the whole of our Scotch bi-
 shops, and would cut them off root and branch; and
 hope I have shewn, that however you have dealt about
 your blows, they are not very deadly. It now only
 remains that I speak a word or two to the other class,
 which strikes at particular bishops, and would insinuate,
 that *their*, and consequently *our* mission is irregular.
 The persons whose consecrations you point at as irre-
 gular are Bishop Keith and Bishop White. Your ob-
 jection against the first is, that he was promoted by bi-
 shop Millar as principal consecrator, when under sus-
 pension by the college-bishops for concurring in Dr
 Rattray's and Mr Dunbar's consecrations: and to the
 other; that he was consecrated without the consent,
 nay, against the protest of Bishop Freebairn *Primus*.---
 As to the first, supposing the fact to have been just as
 you have laid it, which, for good reasons, I very
 much doubt; yet it could not affect the regularity
 of Bishop Keith's consecration, because Bishop Millar's
 suspension was an unwarrantable, and therefore un-
 lawful sentence, the college-bishops having no authority
 till after the concordate, *anno* 1731, when they were
 acknowledged by the diocesan bishops, and when in-
 deed some of themselves, if not all, became *diocesans*,

as we have seen. The consequence of which is, that the sentence being pronounced without proper authority, was null and void. Or, though I should grant, that the power of the college-bishops to censure Bishop Millar had been undoubted, and that Bishop Keith's consecration, under the circumstances you mention, had been at first irregular; yet the legality thereof was afterwards acknowledged and ratified, upon his election to the district of Fife by Bishop Freebairn *Primus*, and Bishop Gillan, two college-bishops; and there were at that time but three alive of that denomination. The deed of election which I have seen, bears date, July 10. 1733. and a few days after, Bishops Freebairn and Gillan wrote Mr Keith in these words, the original of which is yet extant; "R. Rev. Brother, We heartily
 " approve the choice the presbyters of the district of
 " Fife have made of you, and do hereby confirm you
 " bishop of that district. And we pray, God may
 " direct and assist you in the management thereof.
 " Given at Edinburgh, July 17. 1733. Signed, Da-
 " vid Freebairn *Primus*, John Gillan bishop." This is so decisive in favours of Bishop Keith, (the usage-bishops, as you may be certain, having concurred also in his settlement) that I shall add no more upon the subject. As to your objection against Bishop White, that the *Primus* did not concur, nor convocate the meeting, the answer is obvious, that neither one nor other was necessary. For as all things were to be done by the majority, according to the concordate, and there were but five bishops then in Scotland, three of whom concurred in Bishop White's consecration, and again and again petitioned the *Primus* to call a meeting for his promotion, it clearly follows, that since he would not obey the orders of the majority, as had been stipulated in the synod, December 1731, they had a right to meet without him, and to consecrate bishops, and exercise any other part of their sacred function, not only without his consent, but against his protest.

As to your unworthy slings at Bishop Rait; these being *crambe recitata*, I shall take no notice of, because they were long ago answered. And what you have maliciously thrown out, against alterations in the liturgy, and canons-making, is so weak as hardly to deserve a serious refutation. I shall however observe in general, with respect to the first, that if bishops are the supreme governors of the church, as you acknowledge, their authority to regulate the form of public worship, which is not determined in holy scripture, must be indisputable. In the ancient church, we know, that for several hundred years there were, without any breach of communion, almost as many different liturgies (different, I mean, in words, though the same in substance) as there were dioceses; every bishop making one for his own church. And as the episcopal power is not diminished by length of time, all the bishops in Scotland might in our days lawfully do the same, because they are not tied down by any established form. The only question then is, Whether the alterations made in the Scots communion-office are agreeable to the rule of faith? If they are, and evidently for the better too, which no man of sense will deny, then the lawfulness, and even expediency of them is past dispute. Indeed the gentlemen who have taken this trouble, have hitherto done so well, that I am sorry they have not gone a little farther, and introduced the consecration-prayer with that glorious and sublime thanksgiving to God the Father, which gives the ancient liturgies such an inexpressible dignity and fervour of devotion. In the ancient liturgies, the expressions are at once so nervous and so glowing, that it is impossible to hear them read with any kind of reverence, without being inflamed with divine love, and rapt, I may say with St. Paul, into the third heavens. Whereas the introduction to our consecration-prayer is still rather too abrupt: Besides, we are hurried too soon to the consecration of the elements, and
for

for want of those fervent and divine acts of thanksgiving, have not time to be sufficiently *warmed*, nor our souls elevated to that pitch of devotion which they ought to be, when we are employed in the most solemn act of our religion. For which reason, if there be another edition of the Scots communion-office in my time, I shall use all my little interest (without being intimidated by such firebrands as you are) to have the defects of it supplied, by a longer introductory thanksgiving, either from the Clementine or St. James's liturgy. And I am sure it will be received with joy and gratitude by all devout and holy souls, and by every member of the church indeed, who has the least grain of understanding or common sense.

As to what you mutter about the power of making canons,---Whatever privileges presbyters may enjoy in England by a particular constitution, the inferior clergy cannot plead the same in our church which has no legal establishment, unless it can be proved, that presbyters by divine right are constituent members of every national council; which, as far as I know, has never yet been proved. It has been attempted indeed by wiser heads and abler hands than you can pretend to be; but I think has been attempted in vain. And therefore, till that point be once established, your objections to the authority of our synods are as frivolous as they are impertinent, because you have no concern in the matter.

What I have farther to add on this subject, is to bespeak the favour of all into whose hands this small pamphlet may fall, and to beg of them not to judge hastily or harshly of their spiritual fathers, on account of the little differences which sometime took place among them. For, as religion is the best thing in the world, and most worth the contending for, it has generally happened, in all ages and in all countries, through mistake, that disputes about it have been managed with rather too much heat, even by the best men. Indeed,
heaven

heaven only is the place of perfect concord; and therefore it must be expected, that while we continue here cloathed with flesh and blood, there will be always some jarrings and disagreements in the best societies. Even the college of the apostles was not always in perfect harmony; for so hot was the contention between St. Paul and Barnabas about taking Mark along with them, that they parted upon it: Yet that was seemingly but a very trivial, certainly not a very important cause of quarrel. Now, if two apostles of Christ, men endued with greater measures of divine grace than falls to the share of common Christians, I fear, than is generally bestowed on churchmen now-a-days, were so misguided by their passions, and gave such testimony of their infirmities, what wonder if their successors, in later and less enlightened ages, have sometimes split upon the same rock? For my part, I think it no wonder; but I am sorry that a clergyman should, Ham like, take pleasure in exposing unnecessarily the failings of bishops, and even in falsely adding what they were never guilty of, when it was rather his duty, like Shem and Japhet, to have covered their nakedness, had it been greater than it really was. Surely, if to sit and speak against one *single* brother, and to slander one's own mother's son, be that great crime which holy scripture represents it, it must needs be a most enormous load of guilt to pour so much undeserved reproach and obloquy upon a whole national church, fathers and brethren at once, and before pardon can be obtained, must require a very deep humiliation. For my part, I pity your ignorance, I despise your calumny, and I pray God to forgive your sin for it is great. I conclude with beseeching the Father of mercies, to strengthen those who as yet stand in his church; to raise up them who have fallen from it; and finally, to bring into the way of truth you, and all who have erred and are deceived. I am,

R. S.

Your friend and wellwisher.